

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 were pending, and all claims have been withdrawn from consideration. In the outstanding April 12, 2007 Office Action, the Office indicated at page 3, first paragraph, of the action that Claims 1, 4, and 24-48 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. The Office Action Summary indicated that Claims 2, 3, and 5-23 were withdrawn from consideration. Thus, all claims, Claims 1-48, have been withdrawn from consideration. To reduce claim fees, all of the withdrawn claims, Claims 1-48, are canceled without prejudice by the present amendment.

On April 9, 2007, the Applicant's representative conferred with the Examiner regarding the outstanding Office Action. Because all claims had been withdrawn, the Examiner recommended presenting new claims that are directed to the elected invention. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time and consideration regarding this case.

Accordingly, new Claims 49-59 are added to the application by the present amendment. New independent Claim 49 corresponds to Claim 1, now canceled, as it appeared in the amendment filed on March 31, 2006. In addition, further limitations have been added to Claim 49. Specifically, new Claim 49 further specifies that the attribute bounded network is a geographically bounded network. Support for the limitation can be found throughout the application, for example, see Abstract. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

In addition, new Claim 49 further specifies that a searchable index of geographically bounded content is created. Support for the limitation can be found throughout the application, for example, see Abstract, Claims 1, 11, 21, 18 as originally filed, and specification paragraphs 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 27, 28, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41-45, 68-71, 74, 85, 88, 105, 187, 190, 196, 197, 203, 206, 207, 209, 222, 225, 250, 290, and FIG. 1. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

New Claim 49 further specifies that the searchable index is stored locally on a tablet device and is accessible offline without accessing the computer network. Support for this limitation can be found throughout the application as originally filed, at least at 207, 212, 222, 225, 249, and 280. For example, at paragraph 249 the application states that "[a]n embodiment of the present invention comprises a method of using geographic data and other business attributes to isolate a select number of domains which are then spidered . . . to create an indexed

subset of data from the Internet providing significant concurrency of data and which can then be . . . *stored offline to be accessed later in a tablet or other wireless device without the requirement of access to the Internet.*” (Emphasis added). Acceptance is respectfully requested.

New Claim 50 is based on independent Claim 2 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 51 is based on dependent Claim 4 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 52 is based on dependent Claim 5 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 53 is based on dependent Claim 6 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 54 is based on dependent Claim 7 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 55 is based on dependent Claim 8 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 56 is based on dependent Claim 9 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 57 is based on dependent Claim 10 as originally filed (now canceled); new dependent Claim 58 is based on dependent Claim 22 as originally filed (now canceled); and new independent Claim 59 is based on independent Claim 23 (now canceled), and it further includes limitations similar to those set forth in new independent Claim 48. In addition, new Claims 49-59 have been revised ensure proper antecedent basis and correct any typographical errors. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections - June 30, 2006 Office Action

In the June 30, 2006 Office Action, Claim 23 was objected to on the basis of informalities because “an” was used instead of “a.” The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s careful attention to the claims. Claim 23 is now canceled, and thus, the objection is moot. New independent Claim 59 is based on canceled Claim 23, and the grammar issue has been corrected. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - June 30, 2006 Office Action

In the June 30, 2006 Office Action, Claims 1-10 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on U.S. Publication No. 2002/0038348 to Malone, et al. This rejection is traversed. Claims 1-10 and 22-23 are canceled, and thus, the § 102 rejection is moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested. For the reasons discussed below, Malone does not disclose or suggest the limitations of new Claims 49-59.

For explanation, but without limitation to the claims, certain embodiments will be described. An approach for creating a geographically bounded network of computers is provided. A list of geographically bounded electronic addresses, such as URLs, are created and maintained. This geographically bounded list represents a plurality of indexable electronic documents, on a computer network, which are associated with a geographically bounded region. For example, if the geographically bounded region is, for instance, Washington, D.C., then the URLs in the geographically bounded list are associated with Washington, D.C. A plurality of computers associated with the geographically bounded region are identified. A geographically bounded request is received from one of the computers. One or more of the URLs in the geographically bounded list are assigned to the requesting computer. The assigned URL is distributed to the requesting computer, and the requesting computer indexes electronic documents associated with the assigned URL. With this index, a geographically bounded searchable index of the electronic documents is created and stored on a tablet device. The geographically bounded searchable index on the tablet can be assessed without having to access the computer network.

By way of contrast, with conventional distributed crawlers, identification and allocation of distributed processing tasks have been somewhat arbitrary. For example, conventional distributing computing models present problems in that the user of the client computer has no control over which pages his computer crawls. Often the user's computing power will be expended as a result of crawling pages that are of no interest to the user.

With the claimed approach, however, a group of computers are identified that are associated with a common geographic location. Distributed processing tasks for indexing websites that are associated with the location can be allocated to the group of computers. By grouping computers together and assigning these computers similar processing tasks to create a

geographically bounded network, distributed processing tasks can be assigned according to a rational process, thereby increasing resource efficiency and facilitating the development of a geographically bounded community. Further, by storing and indexing geographically bounded content on a tablet device and making this content available offline, a user has the ability to use the tablet device while traveling without connecting to the Internet. The user can use the tablet device to find out information about businesses that are located within the geographically bounded region, e.g. the physical location of the tablet device. In this way, advertisements for a business can be generated when the tablet device is physically located near that business.

Conversely, Malone relates to a distributed network in which storage and indexing of web content can be distributed to several computing devices. Although Malone briefly discusses the notion of geography specific indexing, Malone does not contemplate the claimed geographically bounded network. Specifically, Malone does not *identify a plurality of computers associated with the geographically bounded region*, as required by Claim 49 and similarly required by Claim 59. Furthermore, Malone does not contemplate the mobile tablet device of the present invention that stores the geographically bounded searchable index, and enables this content to be accessible without connecting to a computer network. As such, Malone does not discuss the inventive tablet solutions of the present invention.

Therefore, Malone does not discuss the requirements of Claim 49, namely:

- creating and maintaining a list of attribute bounded electronic addresses representing a plurality of indexable electronic documents, on a computer network, that are associated with a geographically bounded region;
- identifying a plurality of computers associated with the geographically bounded region;
- in response to receiving a geographically bounded request from one of the computers, assigning one or more geographically bounded electronic addresses from the geographically bounded list;
- sending the assigned geographically bounded electronic address to the requesting computer, where the requesting computer processes the assigned geographically bounded electronic address to index one or more electronic documents that are obtained through the assigned geographically bounded electronic address;

- creating a geographically bounded searchable index of the electronic documents that are obtained through the assigned geographically bounded electronic address;
- storing the geographically bounded searchable index on a tablet device, where the geographically bounded searchable index is accessible offline without accessing the computer network.

For reasons similar to those set forth above, independent Claim 59 is not disclosed by Malone. As such, it is respectfully submitted that new independent Claims 49 and 59 are not disclosed by Malone. For reasons similar to those set forth above, dependent Claims 50-58, which depend from base Claim 49, are not disclosed by Malone. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all new Claims 49-59 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

Giovanna H. Fessenden

Registration No. 60,264

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: June 11, 2007